

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:	Date: February 5, 2007
Phuc Ky DO, et al.	Confirmation No. 8869
Serial No: 10/671,981	Group Art Unit: 2182
Filed: September 25, 2003	Examiner: Ilwoo PARK
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AUTOMATICALLY DETERMINING I/O CONNECTOR CONFIGURATION	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

Dear Sir or Madam:

Appellant submits this Appeal Brief pursuant to the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on November 9, 2006.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corp. of Armonk, New York by virtue of an assignment from the inventor(s) recorded in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 25, 2003, at Reel No. 014553, Frame No. 0437.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings known to Appellant, the Appellant's legal representative, or Assignee, which may be related to, directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-15 have been rejected. Appeal is taken from the rejection of claims 1-15.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed subsequent to the final Office action dated July 18, 2006.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present invention is directed to "a system and method for determining the number of I/O products supported by the personal computer" (pg. 2, ln. 22 to pg. 3, ln. 1). A "memory module (which is installed on each I/O panel card) is programmed at the time of manufacture based on the specific I/O connectors installed on the I/O panel. Once the I/O panel is installed in the machine, the contents of the [memory module] is read by the software and tells the software the exact I/O connector configuration of that particular I/O panel" (pg. 6, lns. 8-11). As a result, "[a] family of drivers could be automatically downloaded at one time . . . [and] would be available to the user, even if the specific I/O device was installed later. This would be particularly advantageous for situations where there would be a web connection available at

configuration time, but not available (or only low speed connection available) when particular devices are added (such as a mobile environment)" (pg. 7, lns. 3-7).

Independent claim 1 recites a method for automatically determining a configuration of an I/O connector panel. The method includes providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel (12) to a memory (202) within the I/O connector panel (12) (102). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 17-21; pg. 3, ln. 23 to pg. 4, ln. 2; pg. 4, lns. 8-9; pg. 6, lns. 3-11; Figs. 1-3. The method also includes examining the information in the memory (202) (104). *See, e.g.*, pg. 4, lns. 2 and 6-8; pg. 6, lns. 9-11; Figs. 2-3. The method further includes downloading at least one driver to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel (12) based upon the examined information (106). *See, e.g.*, pg. 4, lns. 2-4 and 9-11; Figs. 2-3.

Independent claim 5 recites an I/O connector panel. The I/O connector panel (12) includes a plurality of I/O connectors (204). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 18-19; pg. 5, lns. 20-21; pg. 6, lns. 7-9, 13-14, and 17-18; Fig. 2. The I/O connector panel (12) also includes a memory (202) containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel (12), wherein, when the memory (202) is examined, at least one driver can be downloaded to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel (12). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 17-21; pg. 3, ln. 23 to pg. 4, ln. 4; pg. 4, lns. 6-11; pg. 6, lns. 3-11; Figs. 2-3.

Independent claim 10 recites a processing system. The processing system includes a core PC function (10). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 7-10; pg. 4, lns. 9-11 and 15-21; Fig. 1. The processing system also includes at least one I/O connector panel (12) coupled to the core PC function (10). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 9-10; pg. 4, lns. 8-11 and 15-17; Fig. 1. The at least one I/O connector panel (12) includes a plurality of I/O connectors (204). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 18-19; pg. 5, lns. 20-21;

pg. 6, lns. 7-9, 13-14, and 17-18; Fig. 2. In addition, the at least one I/O connector panel (12) includes a memory (202) containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel (12), wherein, when the memory (202) is examined, at least one driver can be downloaded to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel (12). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 17-21; pg. 3, ln. 23 to pg. 4, ln. 4; pg. 4, lns. 6-11; pg. 6, lns. 3-11; Figs. 2-3.

Independent claim 14 recites a processing system. The processing system includes a core PC function (10). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 7-10; pg. 4, lns. 9-11 and 15-21; Fig. 1. The processing system also includes a plurality of I/O connector panels (12a, 12b) coupled to the core PC function (10). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 9-10; pg. 4, lns. 8-11 and 15-17; Fig. 1. Each of the plurality of I/O connector panels (12) includes a plurality of I/O connectors (204). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 18-19; pg. 5, lns. 20-21; pg. 6, lns. 7-9, 13-14, and 17-18; Fig. 2. Additionally, each of the plurality of I/O connector panels (12) includes an EEROM (202) containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel (12), wherein, when the memory (202) is examined, at least one driver can be downloaded to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel (12). *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 17-21; pg. 3, ln. 23 to pg. 4, ln. 4; pg. 4, lns. 6-11; pg. 6, lns. 3-11; Figs. 2-3. Furthermore, each of the plurality of I/O connector panels (12) includes connector logic (206) coupled to the EEROM (202) for I/O distribution. *See, e.g.*, pg. 3, lns. 12-16 and 19-21; Fig. 2.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Appellant requests review as to claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 12-13 and their rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,668,376 to Wang et al. (hereinafter “Wang”).

2. Appellant requests review as to claims 2, 6, 11, and 14-15 and their rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Japanese Pat. Pub. No. 2001-117835 to Shinohara et al. (hereinafter “Shinohara”).

VII. ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1, 5, and 10 Are Not Anticipated By Wang

Claim 1 recites a method for automatically determining a configuration of an I/O connector panel. The method includes providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel, examining the information in the memory, and downloading at least one driver to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel based upon the examined information.

Wang does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter.

Wang is directed to “a system and method which automatically locates and loads a device driver in a computer for a peripheral device attached to the computer” (col. 1, lns. 9-11 of Wang). In Wang, when a peripheral device is connected to a computer, “the peripheral device provides unique identification data to the computer to which it is connected. The computer then obtains a URL address, which the manufacturer of the peripheral device previously set up to contain the device driver corresponding to the peripheral device, based on the obtained identification data from the peripheral device. Then, the obtained URL address containing the device driver for the peripheral device is accessed. The device driver is then downloaded from the accessed URL address and installed in the computer” (col. 2, lns. 28-37 of Wang). To obtain the URL address, Wang teaches that either “the peripheral device itself provides the URL address data within its

identification data provided to the computer” or “the computer contains a database at least correlating different identification data to URL addresses” (col. 2, lns. 45-49 of Wang).

(A)(i) Wang does not disclose, teach, or suggest “providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel”

Wang does not disclose, teach, or suggest “providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 1. In the final Office action, the Examiner states:

Wang et al teach . . . providing information [URL database associated with peripheral device identification data in col. 3, line 61 to col. 4, line 4] about the capabilities [peripheral device identification data including a model, a type, and/or a description of the peripheral device to be attached to a connector; fig. 2; col. 4, lines 30-60] of the I/O connector panel to a memory [URL database 13 in fig. 2] within the I/O connector panel . . .

(July 18, 2006 final Office action, pg. 3).

The Examiner also asserts:

Wang provides URL database (information) stored in URL database 13 in computer 1 providing a plurality of I/O connectors; the URL database information is associated with peripheral device identification data including a model, a type, and/or a description of the peripheral device to be attached to a connector.

(December 7, 2005 final Office action, pg. 9).

Based on the Examiner’s comments, it appears that the Examiner is construing “the I/O connector panel” recited in claim 1 to be a computer. Although the Examiner is entitled to a reasonably broad interpretation of the claim terms, the Examiner cannot select an interpretation that is contrary to the accepted meaning of a term by those of ordinary skill in the art. “The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must . . . be consistent with the interpretation that

those skilled in the art would reach,” MPEP § 2111, citing *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

For the Examiner to argue that the “I/O connector panel” recited in claim 1 corresponds to Wang’s “computer 1” is simply inconsistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. In addition, claim 1 specifically recites “downloading at least one driver to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel,” which clearly distinguishes a “system” from an “I/O connector panel” that is coupled thereto. Hence, “computer 1” in Wang cannot be construed as disclosing the “I/O connector panel” recited in claim 1.

Although Wang does disclose a local port 11 to which a peripheral device 2 is connected, Wang does not disclose “a memory within the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as illustrated in Figure 2 of Wang, URL database 13, which the Examiner has construed as disclosing the “memory” recited in claim 1, is completely separate from local port 11. Further, it is not inherent that URL database 13 is within local port 11 because Wang specifically states that even though “URL database 13 . . . [is] shown in FIG. [2] as a part of the computer 1, . . . [it] can also be an external database” (col. 3, lns. 61-63 of Wang). Thus, “URL database 13” in Wang cannot be construed as disclosing “a memory within the I/O connector panel” recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Wang fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 1.

(A)(ii) The Examiner has not established anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention. (See, e.g., Electro Med. Sys. S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, 34 F.3d 1048, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1017, 1019 (Fed. Cir. 1994)). The Examiner has failed to show that the element discussed in section (A)(i) above is disclosed in Wang.

Therefore, claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Wang. Given that claims 5 and 10 each recite elements similar to those of claim 1, claims 5 and 10, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Wang for at least the same reasons.

2. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 Are Patentable Over Wang in View of Shinohara

(B) Claims 1, 5, and 10

Claim 1 recites a method for automatically determining a configuration of an I/O connector panel. The method includes providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel, examining the information in the memory, and downloading at least one driver to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel based upon the examined information.

Wang and Shinohara do not, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter.

Wang is directed to “a system and method which automatically locates and loads a device driver in a computer for a peripheral device attached to the computer” (col. 1, lns. 9-11 of Wang). In Wang, when a peripheral device is connected to a computer, “the peripheral device provides

unique identification data to the computer to which it is connected. The computer then obtains a URL address, which the manufacturer of the peripheral device previously set up to contain the device driver corresponding to the peripheral device, based on the obtained identification data from the peripheral device. Then, the obtained URL address containing the device driver for the peripheral device is accessed. The device driver is then downloaded from the accessed URL address and installed in the computer” (col. 2, lns. 28-37 of Wang). To obtain the URL address, Wang teaches that either “the peripheral device itself provides the URL address data within its identification data provided to the computer” or “the computer contains a database at least correlating different identification data to URL addresses” (col. 2, lns. 45-49 of Wang).

Shinohara is directed to a “printer, information system, and control information installing method” (Title of Shinohara). In Shinohara, “[a] printer 10 which can be connected to a user host connected to a LAN 210 is equipped with a network interface card 110 for communicating with the user host, a flash ROM 118 stored with a URL indicating the location of driver software executed by the user host to control the printer 101, and a CPU 120 which sends the URL to the user host at a request from the user host. The user host is able to download the driver software by accessing the URL through the Internet” (Abstract of Shinohara).

(B)(i) Shinohara does not cure the deficiencies of Wang

As discussed above in Section (A)(i), Wang does not disclose, teach or suggest “providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 1.

Shinohara does not cure the deficiencies of Wang. In particular, Shinohara fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, and the Examiner has not cited any passage of Shinohara as disclosing, teaching, or suggesting, “providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, even if Wang and Shinohara were combined, the combination would neither teach nor suggest “providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 1.

(B)(ii) The Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must make three basic showings. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or in the prior knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant’s disclosure. (*See, e.g., In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).

Since the Examiner has failed to make the three basic showings, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara. Given that claims 5 and 10 each recite elements similar to those of claim 1, claims 5 and 10, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara for at least the same reasons.

(C) Claim 14

Claim 14 recites a processing system that includes a core PC function and a plurality of I/O connector panels coupled to the core PC function, each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising a plurality of I/O connectors, an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel, wherein, when the memory is examined, at least one driver can be downloaded to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel, and connector logic coupled to the EEROM for I/O distribution.

Wang and Shinohara do not, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter.

Wang is directed to "a system and method which automatically locates and loads a device driver in a computer for a peripheral device attached to the computer" (col. 1, lns. 9-11 of Wang). In Wang, when a peripheral device is connected to a computer, "the peripheral device provides unique identification data to the computer to which it is connected. The computer then obtains a URL address, which the manufacturer of the peripheral device previously set up to contain the device driver corresponding to the peripheral device, based on the obtained identification data from the peripheral device. Then, the obtained URL address containing the device driver for the peripheral device is accessed. The device driver is then downloaded from the accessed URL address and installed in the computer" (col. 2, lns. 28-37 of Wang). To obtain the URL address, Wang teaches that either "the peripheral device itself provides the URL address data within its identification data provided to the computer" or "the computer contains a database at least correlating different identification data to URL addresses" (col. 2, lns. 45-49 of Wang).

Shinohara is directed to a “printer, information system, and control information installing method” (Title of Shinohara). In Shinohara, “[a] printer 10 which can be connected to a user host connected to a LAN 210 is equipped with a network interface card 110 for communicating with the user host, a flash ROM 118 stored with a URL indicating the location of driver software executed by the user host to control the printer 101, and a CPU 120 which sends the URL to the user host at a request from the user host. The user host is able to download the driver software by accessing the URL through the Internet” (Abstract of Shinohara).

(C)(i) Wang does not disclose, teach, or suggest “each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel”

Wang does not disclose, teach, or suggest “each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 14. In the final Office action, the Examiner states:

Wang et al teach . . . a plurality of I/O connector panels [e.g., motherboard of computer 1 having a panel for network interface cards, a panel for display cards, a panel for a printer, a scanner, etc. having a plurality of connectors in col. 1, lines 13-16] coupled to the core PC function, each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising a plurality of I/O connectors [col. 1, lines 13-16] about the capabilities [peripheral device identification data including a model, a type, and/or a description of the peripheral device to be attached to a connector, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 30-60] of the I/O connector panel, wherein, when the memory is examined [col. 5, lines 1-6], at least one driver can be downloaded [col. 5, lines 6-15] to a system [operating system in col. 1, lines 25-27] coupled to the I/O connector panel

Wang et al teach the memory storing a URL database indicating a location of a device driver to be downloaded. However, Wang et al does not explicitly disclose the memory is in the form of EEROM. Shinohara et al teach a memory in the form of EEROM [flash ROM 118] storing a URL indicating a location of a device driver to be downloaded. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include memory in the form of EEROM in order to increase flexibility to easily adapt adds or changes of the URL database of manufacturers of peripheral devices.

(July 18, 2006 final Office action, pgs. 5-6).

The first passage of Wang cited by the Examiner states:

Computer users often purchase peripheral devices to be attached to their computers. Common examples of such peripheral devices are a printer, a CD writer, scanner, network interface cards, display cards, etc. FIG. 1 shows a computer 1 with a peripheral device 2 attached thereto. The peripheral device 2 is also accompanied by software 3 to be installed in the computer 1. The software 3 includes a device driver so that the computer 1 can properly drive and operate the peripheral device 2.

(Col. 1, lns. 13-21 of Wang). Hence, as seen from above, nowhere does the cited passage disclose, teach, or suggest “computer 1 having a panel for network interface cards, a panel for display cards, a panel for a printer, a scanner, etc. having a plurality of connectors,” as asserted by the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner cannot simply conclude that “computer 1” in Wang includes “a panel for network interface cards, a panel for display cards, a panel for a printer, a scanner, etc.” Under M.P.E.P. § 2163:

To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence “must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 U.S.P.Q.2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

(M.P.E.P. § 2163.07, 8th ed., 5th rev.). Persons of ordinary skill in the art will readily recognize that it is not necessary for “computer 1” in Wang to include “a panel for network interface cards, a panel for display cards, a panel for a printer, a scanner, etc.,” as asserted by the Examiner.

In addition, even assuming argumentatively that “computer 1” in Wang did include “a panel for network interface cards, a panel for display cards, a panel for a printer . . .” it does not

necessarily follow that each panel has “a plurality of connectors,” as asserted by the Examiner. In fact, if each peripheral device had its own dedicated panel, then each panel should only include one connector for connecting to the particular peripheral device.

Further, as noted in section (A)(i) above, “URL database 13” in Wang cannot be construed as disclosing the “EEROM,” which is part of the “I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 14, because “URL database 13” is illustrated and described as being completely separate from “local port 11” and Wang expressly states that “URL database 13” does not even have to be located within “computer 1.”

Moreover, claim 14 recites that “each of the plurality of I/O connector panels compris[es] . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel.” In contrast, Wang only describes a single “URL database 13.”

Therefore, Wang fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 14.

(C)(ii) Shinohara does not cure the deficiencies of Wang

Shinohara does not cure the deficiencies of Wang. In particular, Shinohara fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, and the Examiner has not cited any passage of Shinohara as disclosing, teaching, or suggesting, “each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 14.

Therefore, even if Wang and Shinohara were combined, the combination would neither teach nor suggest “each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising . . . an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel,” as recited in claim 14.

(C)(iii) The Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must make three basic showings. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or in the prior knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant’s disclosure. (See, e.g., In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).


Since the Examiner has failed to make the three basic showings, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, claim 14, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Wang in view of Shinohara.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, Appellant respectfully submits that the final rejection should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: February 5, 2007



Erin C. Ming
Attorney for Appellant(s)
Reg. No. 47,797
(650) 475-1449

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A method for automatically determining a configuration of an I/O connector panel, the method comprising:

providing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel to a memory within the I/O connector panel;

examining the information in the memory; and

downloading at least one driver to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel based upon the examined information.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the memory comprises an EEROM.

3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the downloading step is provided by software that is independent of the type of I/O connector panel.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the system includes a core PC function block.

5. (Previously Presented) An I/O connector panel comprising:

a plurality of I/O connectors; and

a memory containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel, wherein, when the memory is examined, at least one driver can be downloaded to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel.

6. (Original) The connector panel of claim 5 wherein the memory comprises an EEROM.
7. (Original) The connector panel of claim 5, wherein the system includes a core PC function block.
8. (Original) The connector panel of claim 5, further comprises connector logic coupled to the memory for I/O distribution.
9. (Original) The connector panel of claim 5, wherein the memory contains attributes of the I/O connector panel and attributes of each connector installed on the connector panel.
10. (Previously Presented) A processing system comprising:
 - a core PC function; and
 - at least one I/O connector panel coupled to the core PC function, the at least one I/O connector panel comprising: a plurality of I/O connectors and a memory containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel, wherein, when the memory is examined, at least one driver can be downloaded to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel.
11. (Original) The processing system of claim 10, wherein the memory comprises an EEROM.
12. (Original) The processing system of claim 10, further comprises connector logic coupled to the memory for I/O distribution.

13. (Original) The processing system of claim 10, wherein the memory contains attributes of the I/O connector panel and attributes of each connector installed on the I/O connector panel.

14. (Previously Presented) A processing system comprising:

a core PC function; and

a plurality of I/O connector panels coupled to the core PC function, each of the plurality of I/O connector panels comprising

a plurality of I/O connectors,

an EEROM containing information about the capabilities of the I/O connector panel, wherein, when the memory is examined, at least one driver can be downloaded to a system coupled to the I/O connector panel, and

connector logic coupled to the EEROM for I/O distribution.

15. (Original) The processing system of claim 14, wherein the memory contains attributes of the I/O connector panel and attributes of each connector installed on the I/O connector panel.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None